

Vegetation MOU Working Group

March 5, 2003 meeting notes

Federal Building, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento

Next meeting April 24, 2003, 9-noon CDF-FRAP 1920 20th Street, Sacramento

1. WHR Agricultural Land Classification Needs - Parisi

Monica was asked to confirm with the California Interagency Wildlife Task Group (CIWTG) about the adequacy of using Anderson Class 2 for wildlife modeling in agricultural lands.

The CITWG recently revised the Agricultural land classes in WHR, which Monica distributed in a handout. The old Cropland class was replaced by Dryland Grain and Seed Crops, Irrigated Grain and Seed Crops, Irrigated Hayfield, Irrigated Row and Field Crops, and Rice. The old Orchard-Vineyard class was replaced by Deciduous Orchard, Evergreen Orchard, and Vineyard. CIWTG recommended that we map these new classes. Various stages of each class were also revised, but they don't need to be mapped in a landcover map.

These classes represent an Anderson Level 3 classification, rather than a Level 2 classification. No standard Level 3 classification exists, these classes being customized by anyone to meet specific needs.

The group agreed to adopt WHR's classification of agricultural types as a statewide standard for Anderson Level 3 classification. Naturally that brought up the question about needs for Anderson Level 3 classes for other non-agricultural land cover. Graciela Hinshaw (FWS) and Barbara Simpson (BOR) volunteered to assess their respective agency's needs for other Level 3 classes, such as dividing urban into different degrees of housing density. They will report back at our next meeting.

Anderson Level 1 classes are still core attributes recommended for future mapping efforts. Anderson Level 2 is optional for mid-scale mapping, but should be core for fine-scale mapping.

2. Regional Mapping Project – Evens

Julie presented a summary of concepts for a Central Coast interagency mapping project. She and Todd Keeler-Wolf met with staff of Monterey County to assess their interest in cooperating on such a project. They were very interested and identified several specific areas needing more detailed mapping. A summary of their meeting was distributed at our meeting.

Monterey County has flown aerial photography for half of the county (a \$200,000 value), covering 2 million acres. This is color IR, Year 2000, digital, and orthorectified. They may also have funding for GIS support. TNC is interested in the data and may be able to contribute funding. DFG's Resource Assessment Program is interested in helping coordinate such an effort and they may have funding available as well.

The general concept for the effort is to do an initial satellite pass over the entire area at mid-scale, with focused aerial photography in select areas. USFS is scheduled to start mapping in this area in January 2004. They have 1-15-840 color prints, dated 2002, for all Forests in that area. USFS is also acquiring 2002 Landsat for the central and southern part of the state, as well as 5 m IRS/SPOT panchromatic imagery. They recommend that the coming summer be spent on working out classification and design issues, with actual mapping delayed until next year.

Monterey County may have flown the non-USFS lands, since USFS only is flying USFS lands. Other counties are applying for funding to fly their counties (San Luis Obispo, San Benito, and Santa Clara).

FWS is providing funding for the Central Valley HCPs, suggesting that Section 6 Recovery funds might be available for helping on this effort. They require a state match, though.

Ann Chrisney mentioned that the Central Coast is a blank area for the Waterfowl Joint Venture, Central Coast Joint Venture....?

Some of the issues we need to deal with in developing this proposal are:

- a. Stating clear objectives and additional budget needs
- b. Developing a budget for 2 products at two different scales
- c. How to best integrate different skill sets from different agencies
- d. How to develop one process that integrates two different scale products, how to involve DFG in the broad-scale work that CDF/USFS are experienced at and how to involve CDF/USFS in the finer-scale work that DFG is experienced at
- e. How to use one scale to gain efficiencies in mapping the other scale: using broad-scale to identify target fine-scale area and using fine-scale work to inform broad-scale mapping

Several of the group members will meet on March 10 to discuss these issues and refine the concept paper. Ralph Warbington and Mark Rosenberg will budget a mid-scale product, and Todd and Julie will budget a fine-scale product. Jeff Kennedy and Ann Chrisney will participate in the small group also.

3. Classification Mapping Rules Comparison Table – Keeler-Wolf

Todd and Karen Converse have completed much of the comparison table. Among their findings, they found that 42% of the conifer classes are equivalent between MCV and Calveg. Eight out of 61 classes could not be matched. Either mapping rules need to be developed for these or it should be simply stated that they are not mappable by Calveg. Thirty-five percent of the classes were different, mostly in terms of the percentages of conifers or hardwoods. These differences can be resolved by capturing the percentages as part of the map unit attributes. Karen provided a list of actions still needed for completing the table. DFG still has funding for Karen to complete these actions.

One of the actions is for a team of experts on the different classification systems to review the crosswalk and decide on the appropriateness of the matches. They need to write up mapping instructions, define abbreviations, discuss the needs for resolving differences, and identify which differences need to be resolved with groups of habitat specialists. Todd will lead up this team.

These mapping rules should be run against plot data (such as FIA or other) to resolve the classification differences. This will require additional funding, but could be done next year or as part of the Central Coast mapping project. Existing plot data needs to be compiled, tested against the mapping rules, and validated by field surveys.

USFS has an immediate need for looking at the mapping crosswalks in Yosemite. Hazel will work directly with Todd on this.

4. Map Unit Design Table

Marc asked the group to identify which of the core attributes were easy to add to existing efforts, compared to those which were more difficult. The group decided that it was best to use the Central Coast project to estimate these costs more accurately

5. Agenda ideas for next meeting

Anderson Level 3 classification needs for non-agricultural lands
Regional Mapping Effort – review proposal and funding options
Classification Mapping Rules Comparison Table – Keeler-Wolf – progress
Standards White paper